

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST N	IAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,668	01/29/2004	Juli	an S. Crawford	033583.00007	5426
7590 04/20/2005			EXAMINER		
McNair Law Firm, P.A.				GRAY, JILL M	
P.O. Box 10827 Greenville, SC 29603				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•				1774	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/767,668	CRAWFORD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jill M. Gray	1774				
The MAILING DATE of this communicat Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may ation. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of the property period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC by statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed o	n <u>31 <i>January 2005</i></u> .					
_						
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		·				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-14,17,18 and 21 is/are pendid 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13,14,17,18 and 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	nd 21 is/are withdrawn from co	nsideration.				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	xaminer.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in he priority documents have bee Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-		v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/29/04,7/26/04.		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/767,668 Page 2

Art Unit: 1774

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on January 31, 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is only a single invention presented for consideration, i.e. a multicomponent conductive yarn and method claims 15-16 and 19-21 are restricted to the method of forming that product, and that no extra burden is placed on the PTO because any complete search of the claims of Groups I, II or IV must include both class 428/373 and class 264/173. Applicants also argue that Groups II and IV do not fit the example of unrelated inventions in the MPEP which states that two combinations disclosed having different function are independent inventions, further arguing that the claims are directed to the single invention of a method of forming a multi-component conductive yarn. Finally, applicants argue that the prosecution of combined claims 13, 14, 17, 18 and 21 places no additional burden on the PTO and at best claims 13 and 14 constitute a first species while claims 17 and 18 constitute a second species. This is not found persuasive because the method claims 17 and 21 have methods steps that are distinct from one another. This results in independent and distinct methods, or more specifically, independent and distinct inventions. Because the product of the methods results in yarns similar to that of Group I, the yarn necessarily can be produced by separate and distinct methods, as set forth in the restriction requirement. This results in a burden to the PTO because it necessitates the searching of separate and independent inventions. Having the same classification does not preclude separate, distinct and independent inventions. Also, inventions are

Art Unit: 1774

unrelated if they have different modes of operation or different effects. The inventions of claims 13-14, 17 and 21 clearly have different modes of operation and different effects. Regarding claims 13, 14, 17, 18 and 19, as set forth previously, these inventions contain patentably distinct method steps. This results in separate and distinct inventions, which results in a burden to the PTO. Furthermore, if these claims constitute a first species and a second species, in the event that the restriction requirement where to be withdrawn, the examiner may require applicant to elect a single disclosed species for examination.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Currently, claims 1-12 are under prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igure et al, 6,710,242 B1 (Igure) in view of Patel et al, 6,528,572 B1 (Patel).

Igure teaches a sheath/core composite conductive fiber comprising a primary component of at least one elongated filament formed of polymeric material and a secondary component which is a blend of polymeric material and carbon bonded with said primary component along its length. The carbon material of said secondary

Application/Control Number: 10/767,668 Page 4

Art Unit: 1774

material is present in amounts of 10-50% by weight, per claims 1 and 4. See abstract and column 2, lines 16-18. In addition, Igure teaches that the polymeric material of the primary component and the secondary component can be polyester, as required by claims 2 and 3 and the secondary component can comprise between 0.5% to 50% of the yarn, per claim 6 and is set per claim 9. See column 2, lines 19-21 and Examples. Igure does not teach carbon nanotubes.

Patel teaches conductive polymer compositions comprising polymeric resins such as polyester and electrically conductive filler materials. These filler materials can be carbon black or carbon fibers such as carbon nanotubes wherein the nanotubes are used in amounts less than or equal to about 30 wt% and more preferably less than or equal to about 5 wt%. The conductive resin is used to make various articles. The teachings of Patel would have provided a suggestion to the skilled artisan that in the production of conductive polymers, carbon nanotubes could be used instead of carbon black with the reasonable expectation of successes. Furthermore, Patel teaches that carbon nanotubes can be used in amounts as low as 0.025 wt%. This would have provided motivation to the skilled artisan to modify the teachings of Igure by using carbon nanotubes instead of carbon black as the conductive filler, with the reasonable expectation of obtaining a conductive polymeric composition and fiber with minimal filler loading without sacrificing the mechanical properties of the resultant fiber.

Therefore, the combined teachings of Igure and Patel would have rendered obvious the invention as claimed in present claims 1-4, 6 and 9.

Application/Control Number: 10/767,668

Art Unit: 1774

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hodan 5,840,425 in view of Patel et al, 6,582,572 B1 (Patel) as applied above.

Hodan teaches multicomponent fibers comprising a primary component of at least one elongated filaments and a secondary component that is a blend of polymeric material and carbon, wherein the fibers can be in a sheath/core configuration or side-byside, per claims 1 and 4-5. In addition, the primary component and secondary component can be polyester, per claims 2-3. See column 5, lines 1-7 and lines 62-65. The fibers of Hodan are coated with his secondary component which is an electrically conductive coating containing carbon black, wherein the coating can take place during the fiber manufacturing step or as a separate step. Hence, Hodan teaches a sheath (claim 4), the primary component being set prior to bonding with the secondary component (claim 8), the filaments being set prior to bonding with secondary components (claim 12) and the primary component comprising a plurality of filaments that can be formed of different polymers, (claims 10 and 11). Also, Hodan teaches that his carbon black is present in amounts as low as 2%. See column 4 lines 8-19 and lines 47-49. Hodan does not teach the usage of carbon nanotubes. Patel is as set forth above and would have provided motivation to the skilled artisan to substitute the carbon black of Hodan with carbon nanotubes with the reasonable expectation of obtaining a conductive fiber with lowered amounts of filler loading.

Therefore, the combined teachings of Hodan and Patel would have rendered obvious the invention as claimed in present claims 1-12.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1774

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill M. Gray whose telephone number is 571-272-1524. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner Art Unit 1774

jmg